

SU(2) slave-rotor theory of the attractive Hubbard model

Ki-Seok Kim

School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-012, Korea

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

Extending the U(1) slave-rotor representation[1] of the repulsive Hubbard model, we propose an SU(2) slave-rotor decomposition for the attractive Hubbard model, where the SU(2) slave-rotor variables represent order parameter fluctuations associated with superconductivity and charge density wave. This decomposition method allows us to modify the standard Hartree-Fock mean field theory by incorporating order parameter fluctuations on an equal footing. Deriving an effective SU(2) slave-rotor action from the attractive Hubbard model, and analyzing it at the mean field level, we demonstrate a second order phase transition driven by softening of the slave-rotor variables.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Hf, 74.20.Fg, 71.30.+h, 74.20.-z

Recently, Florens and Georges proposed a slave-rotor representation decomposing bare electrons c_σ into collective charge excitations $e^{-i\theta}$ and renormalized electrons f_σ , i.e., $c_\sigma = e^{-i\theta} f_\sigma$. [1] Applying this representation to the repulsive Hubbard model, they explained the Mott-Hubbard transition from a spin liquid Mott insulator to a Fermi liquid metal in the square lattice. Although the basic scheme of the rotor representation is quite appealing, [1–3] there are several unsatisfactory points in this approach. First of all, effects of spin fluctuations are not well described. This is the reason why the previous slave-rotor theories considered only paramagnetic phases. [1–3] Even if only charge fluctuations are taken into account, the slave-rotor representation is not complete in the sense that the SU(2) pseudospin symmetry in the Hubbard model [4] is not reflected in the U(1) slave-rotor representation. Recently, we extended the U(1) rotor formulation into an SU(2) one for SU(2) charge fluctuations in the repulsive Hubbard model. [5] In this study we found an anomalous metallic phase with a pseudogap.

In this paper we apply the SU(2) slave-rotor representation [5] to the attractive Hubbard model. One main difference from the study of the repulsive Hubbard model is the presence of nonzero order parameters associated with superconductivity (SC) and charge density wave (CDW). An important task is to develop how to incorporate order parameter fluctuations in the conventional mean field theory such as the BCS scheme. A standard weak coupling procedure is to integrate out electron excitations and expand the resulting logarithmic action for order parameter fluctuations around the mean field ground state, called the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) expansion. Although this approach is systematic and firm-based, the procedure to integrate out gapless electrons near the Fermi surface gives rise to several uncertainties in the LGW effective theory, [6] thus it is necessary to treat both electron excitations and order parameter fluctuations on an equal footing.

In this paper we derive an effective theory from the attractive Hubbard model, imposing order parameter fluctuations at the mean field level. Our mean field action consists of two parts. One is a fermion sector correspond-

ing to a modified Hartree-Fock theory, and the other a boson part reflecting order parameter fluctuations, thus allowing us to take into account both electrons and order parameter excitations on an equal footing. It turns out that SU(2) rotor variables represent order parameter fluctuations, and their presence in the effective action admits us to analyze effects of their fluctuations in the mean field approximation. We discuss how this mean field scheme modifies the conventional Hartree-Fock theory.

We consider the attractive Hubbard Hamiltonian

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + H.c.) - \frac{3g}{2} \sum_i c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}, \quad (1)$$

where t is a hopping integral of electrons, and g a coupling constant of effective attractions. The interaction term can be decomposed into pairing and density channels in the following way

$$-\frac{3g}{2} c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} = -\frac{g}{2} c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow} - g c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}.$$

Using the identity

$$n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} = \frac{1}{2} (n_{i\uparrow} + n_{i\downarrow} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (n_{i\uparrow} + n_{i\downarrow} - 1)$$

with $n_{i\sigma} = c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}$, and performing the standard Hubbard-Stratonovich (HS) transformation for each interaction channel, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int Dc_{i\sigma} D\phi_i D\varphi_i e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= \sum_{i\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger (\partial_\tau - \mu) c_{i\sigma} - t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \sum_i (\phi_i c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger + H.c.) + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i |\phi_i|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_i \varphi_i \left(\sum_\sigma c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i \varphi_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here ϕ_i is an SC order parameter associated with an effective pairing potential, and φ_i is a CDW order parameter involved with an effective density potential. We note

that the chemical potential $\mu = \mu_b + g/2$ differs from its bare value μ_b .

One can represent Eq. (2) in terms of a Nambu spinor for convenience in describing superconductivity.[7] Using the Nambu spinor $\psi_i = \begin{pmatrix} c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger \\ c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\psi_i D\phi_{1i} D\phi_{2i} D\phi_{3i} e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - \mu \tau_3) \psi_i - t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\psi_i^\dagger \tau_3 \psi_j + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \sum_i (\phi_{1i} \psi_i^\dagger \tau_1 \psi_i + \phi_{2i} \psi_i^\dagger \tau_2 \psi_i + \phi_{3i} \psi_i^\dagger \tau_3 \psi_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i (\phi_{1i}^2 + \phi_{2i}^2 + \phi_{3i}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where ϕ_{1i} and ϕ_{2i} are the real and imaginary parts of the pairing potential ϕ_i , i.e., $\phi_i = \phi_{1i} - i\phi_{2i}$, and φ_i is replaced with ϕ_{3i} for a unified notation of SU(2) symmetry. Introducing a pseudospin variable $\vec{\Omega}_i = (\phi_{1i}, \phi_{2i}, \phi_{3i})$, one can express Eq. (3) in the following compact form

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\psi_i D\vec{\Omega}_i e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - \mu \tau_3) \psi_i - t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\psi_i^\dagger \tau_3 \psi_j + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger (\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\tau}) \psi_i + \frac{1}{4g} \sum_i \text{tr}(\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\tau})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Since the above effective Lagrangian is quadratic in electron excitations, one can formally integrate out the ψ_i fields to obtain an effective Lagrangian of the pseudospin order parameter by expanding the resulting logarithmic term for the $\vec{\Omega}_i$ fields. It should be noted that the expansion parameter is g/D , where D is an electron bandwidth, thus this expansion can be justified in $g/D \ll 1$. Although the weak coupling condition is satisfied, there are still several unsatisfactory points in this order parameter action. It is difficult to justify the LGW expansion in the presence of gapless electrons because they can cause nonlocal interactions between order parameters, making it unreliable a conventional treatment in a local effective action.[6] In this respect we do not integrate out the fermion excitations in deriving an effective action. Instead, we treat both electrons and order parameter excitations on an equal footing, as mentioned before.

For the equal treatment of electrons and order parameters, we apply a strong coupling approach to this problem, meaning to solve the interaction term first. Remember that the weak coupling approach is to solve the kinetic energy term first and treat the interaction term perturbatively based on the non-interacting fermion ensemble. Using the identity called the CP^1 representation[8]

$$\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\tau} = m_i U_i \tau_3 U_i^\dagger, \quad U_i = \begin{pmatrix} z_{i\uparrow} & -z_{i\downarrow}^\dagger \\ z_{i\downarrow} & z_{i\uparrow}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where $z_{i\sigma}$ in the SU(2) matrix field U_i is a boson field with pseudospin σ to satisfy the unimodular constraint $\sum_\sigma |z_{i\sigma}|^2 = 1$, and performing the gauge transformation

$$\eta_{i\sigma} = U_{i\sigma\sigma'}^\dagger \psi_{i\sigma'}, \quad (6)$$

one can solve the coupling term from $-\sum_i m_i \psi_i^\dagger (\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\tau}) \psi_i$ to $-\sum_i m_i \eta_i^\dagger \tau_3 \eta_i$, where m_i is an amplitude of the pseudospin order parameter. We call $z_{i\sigma}$ and $\eta_{i\sigma}$ a bosonic spinon and a fermionic chargin, respectively.

In this strong coupling approach we find an interesting physics that order parameter fluctuations $\vec{\Omega}_i$ carrying a pseudospin quantum number 1 fractionalize into bosonic spinons $z_{i\sigma}$ with pseudospin 1/2 in order to screen out the pseudospin of an electron due to strong interactions. The components of the η_i field are given

$$\eta_i = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{i\uparrow} \\ \eta_{i\downarrow} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} + z_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} \\ -z_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow} + z_{i\uparrow} c_{i\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Another way to say this fractionalization is that bare electrons $\psi_{i\sigma}$ fractionalize into bosonic spinons $U_{i\sigma\sigma'}$ and fermionic chargin $\eta_{i\sigma}$, i.e., $\psi_{i\sigma} = U_{i\sigma\sigma'} \eta_{i\sigma'}$ owing to strong interactions.

Inserting Eqs.(5) and (6) into Eq. (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\eta_i D U_i \delta(U_i^\dagger U_i - 1) e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= \sum_i \eta_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} + U_i^\dagger \partial_\tau U_i - \mu U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_i) \eta_i \\ &\quad - t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\eta_i^\dagger U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_j \eta_j + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \sum_i m_i \eta_i^\dagger \tau_3 \eta_i + \frac{1}{4g} \sum_i \text{tr}(m_i \tau_3)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that the integration measure $\int D\psi_i D\vec{\Omega}_i$ in Eq. (4) is changed into $\int D\eta_i D U_i \delta(U_i^\dagger U_i - 1)$ in Eq. (7). The number of integration variables is 4 in both cases. One important point in this expression is that we impute interactions between electrons and order parameter fluctuations to couplings between charginos (renormalized electrons) and spinons (fractionalized pseudospins) in the kinetic energy. A standard way to treat this nontrivial kinetic energy term is to integrate out the chargin fields,

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D U_i \delta(U_i^\dagger U_i - 1) \exp \left[- \int_0^\beta d\tau \frac{1}{4g} \sum_i \text{tr}(m_i \tau_3)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{tr} \ln \left(\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - m_i \tau_3 - \mu U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_i + U_i^\dagger \partial_\tau U_i - t U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_j \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where tr in the logarithm means sum over time, space, spin and matrix elements. Expanding the logarithmic term for the bosonic spinons $U_{i\sigma\sigma'}$ ($z_{i\sigma}$), one obtains an effective action of the spinons. One important difference from the weak coupling approach is that the expansion parameter is D/g instead of g/D . Unfortunately, this conventional strong coupling approach has an important

defect. Metallic physics (information of a Fermi surface) of electrons is not introduced in this expression. Actually, expanding the logarithmic term in the expansion parameter D/g , the resulting effective action is known to be the $O(3)$ nonlinear σ model appropriate to an insulating magnet, describing competition between SC and CDW.[9]

Instead of integrating out fermions, we decouple the "interacting" kinetic energy into the conventional "non-interacting" one via the HS transformation

$$\begin{aligned} & -t(\eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{j\gamma\delta} \eta_{j\delta} + H.c.) \\ & \rightarrow t \left[F_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} E_{ij}^{\dagger\alpha\delta} + E_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} F_{ij}^{\dagger\alpha\delta} \right. \\ & \left. - (\eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger F_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} \eta_{j\delta} + E_{ij}^{\dagger\alpha\delta} U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{j\gamma\delta}) - H.c. \right], \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where E_{ij} and F_{ij} are HS matrix fields associated with hopping parameters of the η_i fermions and U_i bosons, respectively. They are self-consistently determined from the saddle point equations in the mean field approximation

$$E_{ij}^{\dagger\alpha\delta} = \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{j\delta} \rangle, \quad F_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} = \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{j\gamma\delta} \rangle. \quad (10)$$

We make an ansatz for the hopping matrices as

$$E_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} = E \tau_{3\alpha\gamma}, \quad F_{ij}^{\alpha\delta} = F \tau_{3\alpha\gamma}, \quad (11)$$

where E and F are amplitudes of the hopping parameters. The reason why we introduce the τ_3 matrix is that the fermion sector should recover the original electron Lagrangian Eq. (4) as the slave-rotor representation[3] does.

We also perform a mean field decomposition in the coupling term of the time part as

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} \eta_{i\gamma} \approx \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} \rangle \eta_{i\gamma} \\ & + \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{i\gamma} \rangle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} - \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{i\gamma} \rangle \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} \rangle \\ & \equiv \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger h_{i\alpha\gamma} \eta_{i\gamma} + l_{i\alpha\gamma} U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} - h_{i\alpha\gamma} l_{i\alpha\gamma} \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

with the mean field ansatz of

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i\alpha\gamma} &= \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \partial_\tau U_{i\beta\gamma} \rangle \approx h_i \tau_{3\alpha\gamma}, \\ l_{i\alpha\gamma} &= \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{i\gamma} \rangle \approx l_i \tau_{3\alpha\gamma}. \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

This ansatz is consistent with Eq. (11). The chemical potential term is decoupled in the mean field level as

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mu \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} \eta_{i\delta} \approx -\mu \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} \rangle \eta_{i\delta} \\ & -\mu \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{i\delta} \rangle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} + \mu \langle \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger \eta_{i\delta} \rangle \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} \rangle \\ & \equiv -\mu \eta_{i\alpha}^\dagger q_{i\alpha\delta} \eta_{i\delta} - \mu l_{i\alpha\delta} U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} + \mu l_{i\alpha\delta} q_{i\alpha\delta} \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$q_{i\alpha\delta} = \langle U_{i\alpha\beta}^\dagger \tau_{3\beta\gamma} U_{i\gamma\delta} \rangle = q_i \tau_{3\alpha\delta}. \quad (15)$$

Inserting Eqs. (9), (11), (12), (13), (14), and (15) into Eq. (7), we find an effective Lagrangian for the mean field analysis of the attractive Hubbard model

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\eta_i D U_i \delta(U_i^\dagger U_i - 1) e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= L_0 + L_\eta + L_U, \\ L_0 &= 4t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} EF - 2 \sum_i h_i l_i + 2\mu \sum_i q_i l_i + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i m_i^2, \\ L_\eta &= \sum_i \eta_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - m_i \tau_3 + h_i \tau_3 - \mu q_i \tau_3) \eta_i \\ &\quad - tF \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\eta_i^\dagger \tau_3 \eta_j + H.c.), \\ L_U &= \sum_i l_i \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \partial_\tau U_i \tau_3) - tE \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_j \tau_3 + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \mu \sum_i l_i \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_i \tau_3). \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

In this effective Lagrangian l_i , h_i , q_i and m_i are not all independent. One can easily see $2l_i = m_i/g$. Introducing $-h_{ri} = h_i - \mu q_i$ in Eq. (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\eta_i D U_i \delta(U_i^\dagger U_i - 1) e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= L_0 + L_\eta + L_U, \\ L_0 &= 4t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} EF + \frac{1}{g} \sum_i h_{ri} m_i + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i m_i^2, \\ L_\eta &= \sum_i \eta_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - m_i \tau_3 - h_{ri} \tau_3) \eta_i - tF \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\eta_i^\dagger \tau_3 \eta_j + H.c.), \\ L_U &= \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i m_i \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \partial_\tau U_i \tau_3) - tE \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_j \tau_3 + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mu}{2g} \sum_i m_i \text{tr}(U_i^\dagger \tau_3 U_i \tau_3). \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

To explore the consequences of order parameter fluctuations in the effective rotor action Eq. (17) at the saddle point level, we express Eq. (17) in terms of the spinons $z_{i\sigma}$ with the mean field ansatz $m_i = (-1)^i m$ and

$$h_{ri} = (-1)^i h_r,$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int D\eta_i D z_{i\sigma} e^{-\int_0^\beta d\tau L}, \\ L &= L_0 + L_\eta + L_z, \\ L_0 &= 2t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} EF + \frac{1}{g} \sum_i h_r m + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i m^2, \\ L_\eta &= \sum_i \eta_i^\dagger (\partial_\tau \mathbf{I} - (-1)^i m \tau_3 - (-1)^i h_r \tau_3) \eta_i \\ &\quad - tF \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\eta_i^\dagger \tau_3 \eta_j + H.c.), \\ L_z &= \frac{m}{g} \sum_{i\sigma} (-1)^i z_{i\sigma}^\dagger \partial_\tau z_{i\sigma} - tE \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (\sigma z_{i\sigma}^\dagger z_{j\sigma} + H.c.) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mu m}{g} \sum_{i\sigma} (-1)^i \sigma z_{i\sigma}^\dagger z_{i\sigma} + \lambda \sum_i (\sum_\sigma |z_{i\sigma}|^2 - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where λ is a Lagrange multiplier field to impose the unimodular constraint, replaced with its mean field value. We also replaced $2E$ with E in the above.

The SU(2) slave-rotor action consists of two parts. One is the fermion sector L_η , and the other the boson part L_z . The fermion action coincides with a conventional mean field theory, the Hartree-Fock theory except for the renormalization of the bandwidth $t \rightarrow tF$, if we regard $m + h_r$ as an effective magnetic field. At zero temperature the fermion sector thus always remains in the "magnetic" phase with a gap to quasiparticle excitations due to Fermi-nesting if half filling in the square lattice is considered. However, it is important to see that quantum fluctuations of the $z_{i\sigma}$ bosons reduce the staggered pseudo-magnetization m , compared to the Hartree-Fock magnetization. The boson action, on the other hand, can be considered as corrections to the fermion mean field theory due to order parameter fluctuations, not captured in the LGW framework. It is basically the same as the CP^1 Lagrangian of the O(3) nonlinear σ model, but modified by the Berry phase term $\frac{m}{g} \sum_{i\sigma} (-1)^i z_{i\sigma}^\dagger \partial_\tau z_{i\sigma}$. The presence of $\sigma = \pm$ in the spinon Lagrangian L_z , resulting from the τ_3 matrix, also leads to modification of the CP^1 Lagrangian. If the τ_3 matrix is not utilized in Eq. (11), the hopping term in L_z vanishes, thus Eq. (4) cannot be recovered from Eq. (18) by following its reverse procedure.

In analyzing the effective SU(2) rotor Lagrangian Eq. (18), we confine our attention to half-filling ($\mu = 0$) in the square lattice for simplicity, and discuss effects of hole doping later. Let us begin with the fermion sector. The fermion Lagrangian is well known because its structure is nothing but the BCS theory. The mean-field conditions for m and E at $T = 0$ read

$$\frac{m}{2g(m + h_r)} = \sum_k \frac{1}{E_k^\eta}, \quad DE/2 = \sum_k \frac{F \epsilon_k^{\eta^2}}{E_k^\eta}. \quad (19)$$

Here $\epsilon_k^\eta = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ is the bare band in the absence of effective exchange splitting introduced by non-

zero $m + h_r$, and $E_k^\eta = \sqrt{(F \epsilon_k^\eta)^2 + (m + h_r)^2}$ is the char-gon energy with a gap set by $m + h_r$. $D = 4t$ is a half of the bandwidth, and the k -sum in both equations is over the reduced Brillouin zone. One important difference from the conventional Hartree-Fock scheme is the presence of h_r , modifying the first equation.

The spinon Lagrangian is given in the energy-momentum space

$$\begin{aligned} L_z &= \sum_{\sigma k\nu} z_{\sigma k\nu}^\dagger (\lambda + E \sigma \epsilon_k^z) z_{\sigma k\nu} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sigma k\nu} z_{\sigma k+Q\nu}^\dagger (\lambda - E \sigma \epsilon_k^z) z_{\sigma k+Q\nu} \\ &\quad + \frac{m}{g} \sum_{\sigma k\nu} i\nu (z_{\sigma k+Q\nu}^\dagger z_{\sigma k\nu} + z_{\sigma k\nu}^\dagger z_{\sigma k+Q\nu}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mu m}{g} \sum_{\sigma k\nu} \sigma (z_{\sigma k+Q\nu}^\dagger z_{\sigma k\nu} + z_{\sigma k\nu}^\dagger z_{\sigma k+Q\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\epsilon_k^z = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ is the bare spinon dispersion with $Q = (\pi, \pi)$. The bosonic k -sum is also over the reduced Brillouin zone. The boson part can be diagonalized using a pair of operators $(\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu}, \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu})$ related to $(z_{\sigma k\nu}, z_{\sigma k+Q\nu})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} z_{\sigma k\nu} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cosh \theta_{\sigma k} - \sinh \theta_{\sigma k}) (\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu} + \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}), \\ z_{\sigma k+Q\nu} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cosh \theta_{\sigma k} + \sinh \theta_{\sigma k}) (\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu} - \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

After taking $\cosh 2\theta_{\sigma k} = \lambda/E_k^z$, $\sinh 2\theta_{\sigma k} = E \sigma \epsilon_k^z/E_k^z$, and $E_k^z = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - (E \epsilon_k^z)^2}$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} L_z &= i \frac{m}{g} \sum_{\sigma k\nu} \nu (\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{1k\nu} - \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mu m}{g} \sum_{\sigma k\nu} \sigma (\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{1k\nu} - \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k\nu} E_k^z (\gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{\sigma 1k\nu} + \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}^\dagger \gamma_{\sigma 2k\nu}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The boson spectrum E_k^z is gapped if $\lambda - ED > 0$ while $\lambda - ED = 0$ leads to the condensation of $z_{i\sigma}$.

The mean field equations for λ , F , and h_r are obtained to be

$$\frac{m}{g\lambda} = \sum_k \frac{1}{E_k^z}, \quad DF = \sum_k \frac{Eg}{m} \frac{\epsilon_k^{z2}}{E_k^z} \quad (23)$$

and

$$h_r = \sum_k \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_\nu \frac{2\nu^2 m/g}{E_k^{z2} + \nu^2 m^2/g^2}. \quad (24)$$

An important point in Eq. (24) is that if we do not introduce an energy cutoff in the frequency integral, the

mean field equation (24) diverges after doing the frequency integral. However, one need not be surprised at this divergence because it also happens in the mean field equations for E and F unless we introduce a momentum cutoff, here the bandwidth D . In this respect it is necessary to introduce an energy cutoff. It is natural to take the energy cutoff as m because the presence of m allows this decomposition. When evaluating the frequency integral, we first divide the integral into two parts, divergent and divergent-free parts. We calculate the divergent part within the energy cutoff, but the divergent-free part without the energy cutoff, i.e., performing the Matsubara summation in the divergent-free integral. As a result, Eq. (24) reads

$$h_r = \frac{2g}{\pi} - \frac{g^2}{m^2} \sum_k^I E_k^z. \quad (25)$$

To get an idea on the analytical structure of the set of self-consistent equations obtained above, we first rewrite Eqs. (19), (23) and (25) as the integration over the energy with a certain density of states $D(\epsilon)$, and approximate it with a constant value, $D(\epsilon) = 1/(2D)$, thus $\sum_k^I = (1/4D) \int_{-D}^D d\epsilon$. The mean-field equations are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} m + h_r &= \frac{FD}{\sinh\left[\frac{FD}{g} \frac{m}{m+h_r}\right]}, \\ E &= \frac{\sinh[2FD/g] - 2FD/g}{4 \sinh^2[FD/g]}, \\ \frac{2mED}{g\lambda} &= \sin^{-1}(ED/\lambda), \\ F &= \frac{4mED/g\lambda - \sin[4mED/g\lambda]}{8(m/g) \sin^2[2mED/g\lambda]}, \\ h_r &= \frac{2g}{\pi} - \frac{g^2}{m^2} \frac{ED\sqrt{\lambda^2 - (ED)^2} + \lambda^2 \sin^{-1}(ED/\lambda)}{4ED}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The Bose condensation occurs at $\lambda_c = E_c D$, giving rise to $m_c/g = \pi/4 \approx 0.8$. The critical $(g/D)_c$ is determined from the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{4} \frac{(D/g)_c [\sinh(D/g)_c - (D/g)_c]}{\sinh^2[(1/2)(D/g)_c]} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{(D/g)_c}{\sinh\left[\frac{(\pi/2)(D/g)_c}{\pi/4 + 2/\pi - \frac{1}{4} \frac{(D/g)_c [\sinh(D/g)_c - (D/g)_c]}{\sinh^2[(1/2)(D/g)_c]}}\right]} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{2}{\pi}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Solving this equation numerically, we find $(g/D)_c \approx 0.3$. This means that the Bose condensation of spinons appears in $g/D < (g/D)_c$ while they become gapped in $g/D > (g/D)_c$.

When the bosonic spinons are condensed, this phase is identified with an SC state or a CDW phase. We cannot

determine which phase arises because of the SU(2) pseudospin symmetry in the Hubbard model at half filling. If easy plane anisotropy is introduced, the resulting state would be an SC phase. When the spinons are gapped, the resulting phase is an insulating state owing to a gap in the chargon spectrum at half filling. Remember that chargon excitations are always gapped at half filling due to Fermi-nesting. Thus, the SU(2) slave-rotor mean field theory shows a second order phase transition from an SC state to an insulating phase at half filling, varying the strength of local attractions. One may interpret the insulating phase as a preformed-pair state due to strong phase fluctuations of preformed pairs.

So far, we performed a saddle-point analysis and obtained a mean-field picture, showing a second order phase transition for the spinon field $z_{i\sigma}$ associated with order parameter fluctuations. It is natural to ask the stability of the mean-field picture against gauge fluctuations a_{ij} that appear in the phase fluctuations of the hopping parameters, $E_{ij} = E e^{ia_{ij}\tau_3\tau_3}$ and $F_{ij} = F e^{ia_{ij}\tau_3\tau_3}$, where E and F are the mean field values obtained before. It should be noted that the U(1) pseudospin-gauge field a_{ij} is compact, thus allowing instanton excitations[10]. From the seminal work of Fradkin and Shenker[11] we know that there can be no phase transition between the Higgs and confinement phases. The order parameter discriminating the Higgs phase from the confinement one has not been known yet. In this respect only a crossover behavior is expected. In the present problem the phase-coherent state corresponds to the Higgs phase while the phase-incoherent state coincides with the confinement phase. Applying Fradkin and Shenker's result to the present problem, we conclude that the second order phase transition turns into a crossover between the coherent and incoherent phases. The pseudospin order parameter, being a gauge-invariant quantity, remains unaffected by the gauge fluctuation.

One cautious person may ask what the crossover means physically. Since a systematic method for evaluating the electron spectral function in the confinement phase is not known, it is difficult to say any physical statements for the spectral function in fact. However, recalling the recent study that considerable portions of coherent quasiparticle spectral weights are transferred to incoherent backgrounds as the local interactions are increased,[12] the crossover in this paper can be understood by transferring the coherent spectral weights of quasiparticles to the incoherent backgrounds. Actually, our mean field analysis coincides with this picture.

Away from half filling, a nonzero chemical potential produces easy axis anisotropy due to the pseudospin dependence in the chemical potential term, thus favoring a CDW order. Furthermore, metallic physics of chargon excitations appears because Fermi-nesting is destroyed away from half filling. Then, the gapped phase of spinon excitations may be stable against gauge fluctuations owing to the presence of gapless fermion excitations.[13] This anomalous metallic phase may be related with a

pseudogap phase in the context of high T_c superconductivity.

In this paper we developed a mean field theory taking both electron excitations and order parameter fluctuations on an equal footing. The effective field theory consists of two parts. One is a fermion sector corresponding to the conventional Hartree-Fock or BCS mean field scheme. The other is a boson sector representing order parameter fluctuations that become fractionalized in the case of strong interactions, and are expressed as ro-

tor variables. Softening of rotor fluctuations leads to a second order transition. Although our mean field analysis was performed in an insulating phase in the present paper, we believe that the present slave-rotor formulation would be more useful for studying quantum phase transitions in itinerant electrons because the presence of gapless fermion excitations can make the gapped phase of rotor excitations stable against gauge fluctuations.

Extremely helpful discussions with Prof. J.-H. Han are appreciated.

-
- [1] S. Florens and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 165111 (2002); S. Florens and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 035114 (2004).
 - [2] S.-S. Lee and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 036403 (2005).
 - [3] Ki-Seok Kim, cond-mat/0510564 (unpublished); Ki-Seok Kim, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 235115 (2006).
 - [4] C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2144 (1989); C. N. Yang and S. C. Zhang, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **4**, 759 (1990); I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 14503 (1999).
 - [5] Ki-Seok Kim, cond-mat/0603473 (unpublished).
 - [6] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 6513 (1997); D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and T. Vojta, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165112 (2002); A. Chubukov, C. Pepin, and J. Rech, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 147003 (2004); Ar. Abanov and A. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 255702 (2004).
 - [7] J. R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity*, Chap. 7 (Addison-Wesley, 1988).
 - [8] Ki-Seok Kim, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 144426 (2005).
 - [9] Ki-Seok Kim, cond-mat/0511620 (unpublished).
 - [10] A. M. Polyakov, *Gauge Fields and Strings*, Chap. 4 (Harwood Academic Publishers, 1987).
 - [11] E. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 3682 (1979).
 - [12] K. Borejsza and N. Dupuis, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 085119 (2004).
 - [13] M. Hermele, T. Senthil, M. P. A. Fisher, P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 214437 (2004); For a brief review, see Ki-Seok Kim, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 140405(R) (2004) and Ki-Seok Kim, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 014406 (2005). In the case of non-relativistic fermions see Ki-Seok Kim, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 245106 (2005).